

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/672,040	Applicant(s) OLIJVE ET AL.	
	Examiner James W. Rogers, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1618	

All Participants:

(1) James W. Rogers, Ph.D.

(2) Roger Pitt.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Mike Hartley.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 January 2006

Time: 10:30 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

all pertinent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rogers contacted applicants counsel Roger Pitt registration number 46996 concerning a proposed examiners amendment for application number 10/672,040 to include the limitation within claim 25 into claim 23 so that claim 23 included a pharmaceutically suitable ingredient. Also examiner Rogers proposed to amend claim 44 by deleting the words "nutritionally or" and "or cosmetically". These amendments were proposed because of applicants response to an election/restriction in which applicants elected without traverse an oil in water emulsion further comprising a pharmaceutical ingredient. Roger Pitt explained to the examiner that he did not believe this amendment was necessary because the generic claim 23 is allowable. Upon discussing this issue with his supervisor Mike Hartley examiner Rogers called Roger Pitt at around 11 AM on 1/18/2006 and stated to Roger Pitt that the examiner will withdraw the election/restriction requirement filed 05/04/2006 and allow all the outstanding claims 23,25,27-40,42 and 44-49..